arXiv:math/9407206v1 [math.LO] 17 Jul 1994

Forcing tightness in products of fans

Jörg Brendle*and Tim LaBerge

February 8, 2008

Abstract

We define several notions of forcing that allow us to manipulate the tightness of products of fans. Some consequences include: $t(F_\theta \times F_\omega) = \theta$ does not imply the existence of a (θ, ω)-gap, new examples of first countable $<\theta$-cwH spaces that are not $\leq\theta$-cwH for singular cardinals θ, and for cardinals $\lambda \leq \theta$ with $cf(\theta) \geq \omega_1$ and either λ regular or $\lambda^\omega \leq \theta$, a first countable $<\theta$-cwH not $\leq\theta$-cwH space that can be made cwH by removing a closed discrete set of cardinality λ. We also prove two theorems that characterize tightness of products of fans in terms of families of integer-valued functions.

1 Introduction

The θ-fan F_θ is the quotient space obtained by identifying the non-isolated points of the product $\theta \times (\omega + 1)$ to a single point ∞. (Here θ has the discrete topology and $\omega + 1$ has the order topology.) Thus, a neighborhood of ∞ is a set of the form

$$V_g = \{\infty\} \cup \{\langle \alpha, m \rangle : m > g(\alpha)\} \qquad g \in \omega^\theta.$$

When $\lambda \leq \theta$, we use sets

$$V_g \times U_f = \{(\infty, \infty)\} \cup \{(\langle \beta, m \rangle, \langle \alpha, n \rangle) : m > g(\beta) \wedge n > f(\alpha)\} \qquad g \in \omega^\theta,\ f \in \omega^\lambda$$

as a base at (∞, ∞) in the product $F_\theta \times F_\lambda$.

The tightness $t(p, X)$ of a point p in a topological space X is the supremum of the cardinalities of all $A \subseteq X$ such that $p \in \overline{A}$, but whenever $B \subseteq A$ and $|B| < |A|$, then $p \notin \overline{B}$. The tightness of X is then $t(X) = \sup\{t(p, X) : p \in X\}$. The tightness of X is the least upper bound of the cardinalities of the subsets of X needed to define the closure operator.

Clearly, the tightness of F_θ is ω, and it is not hard to see that $t(F_\theta \times F_\lambda) = t((\infty, \infty), F_\theta \times F_\lambda)$ (details are in [LL]). This motivates the following definition.

---

*Supported by DFG–grant Nr. Br 1420/1–1.

Definition 1.1 Let $\lambda \leq \theta$ be infinite cardinals and suppose that $A \subseteq (\theta \times \omega) \times (\lambda \times \omega)$.

(1) If $\lambda < \theta$, we say that A is (θ, λ)-good if

  (a) $(\infty, \infty) \in \overline{A}$;

  (b) $\forall B \in A^{<\theta}\ ((\infty, \infty) \notin \overline{B})$; and

  (c) $\forall E \in [\lambda]^{<\lambda}\ ((\infty, \infty) \notin \overline{A \cap ((\theta \times \omega) \times (E \times \omega))}\,)$.

(2) If $\lambda = \theta$, we say that A is (θ, θ)-good if (a), (b), and the following are true:

  (c) $\forall E \in [\theta]^{<\theta}\ ((\infty, \infty) \notin \overline{A \cap ((\theta \times \omega) \times (E \times \omega))}\,)$ and

  (d) $\forall F \in [\theta]^{<\theta}\ ((\infty, \infty) \notin \overline{A \cap ((F \times \omega) \times (\theta \times \omega))}\,)$.

The existence of a (θ, λ)-good set A implies that $t(F_\theta \times F_\lambda) = \theta$; moreover, if either $\theta' < \theta$ and $\lambda' \leq \lambda$ or $\theta' \leq \theta$ and $\lambda' < \lambda$, then A cannot be construed as a subset of $F_{\theta'} \times F_{\lambda'}$.

As shown in [LL], the existence of a (θ, λ)-good set is equivalent to the existence of a first countable $<\theta$-cwH space X with a closed discrete set D of cardinality θ such that D is not separated and

$$\lambda = \min\{|E| : E \subseteq D,\ D \setminus E \text{ is separated, and } \forall F \in [E]^{<|E|}\ ((D \setminus E) \cup F \text{ is separated})\}.$$

Also in [LL], it is shown that $\lambda^\omega < \theta$ implies that there are no (θ, λ)-good sets; in particular, GCH implies that there are no (θ, λ)-good sets whenever $\theta > \lambda \geq cf(\lambda) > \omega$.

In this paper, we give several forcing constructions of (θ, λ)-good sets. Starting with a regular cardinal θ, the first construction gives a model with a (θ, ω)-good set but no (θ, ω)-gaps (this model has been obtained independently by Haim Judah [J]). We then modify this construction to give a (θ, ω)-good set when θ is a singular cardinal of uncountable cofinality; this yields an easy consistent example of a first countable space in which cwH fails for the first time at a singular cardinal (different examples of such spaces were constructed by Fleissner and Shelah [FS] and by Koszmider [K]). The final construction gives models with (θ, λ)-good sets when $cf(\theta) \geq \omega_1$ and either λ is regular and $\lambda \leq \theta$ or $\lambda^\omega \leq \theta$. When $\theta > \lambda$, the first countable $<\theta$-cwH not $\leq\theta$-cwH spaces obtained from these good sets are new, in the sense that they can be made cwH by removing a small (cardinality λ) closed discrete set.

We also prove two theorems that characterize the existence of certain good sets in terms of integer-valued functions. These theorems will use the following relations $\leq^+$ and $\leq^*$ on ω^λ that generalize the usual notion of $\leq^*$ on ω^ω.

Definition 1.2 Let λ be an infinite cardinal, and let $f, g \in \omega^\lambda$.

(a) We say $f \leq^* g$ if for all but finitely many $\alpha < \lambda$, $f(\alpha) \leq g(\alpha)$.

(b) We say $f \leq^+ g$ if there is a $k \in \omega$ such that for all $\alpha < \lambda$, either $f(\alpha) \leq g(\alpha)$ or $f(\alpha) \leq k$.

Notice that $\leq^+$ is a reflexive, transitive relation on ω^λ. We put $f =^+ g$ if there is a $k \in \omega$ such that for all $\alpha \in \lambda$, either $f(\alpha) = g(\alpha)$ or both $g(\alpha), f(\alpha) \leq k$. This determines an equivalence relation on ω^λ, and the order on these equivalence classes induced by $\leq^+$ is a partial order. If $\lambda = \omega$ and we restrict ourselves to strictly increasing functions, then the two notions $\leq^*$ and $\leq^+$ coincide. Also note that $f \leq^* g$ always implies $f \leq^+ g$.

The following lemma gives a canonical way to construct a (θ, λ)-good set. We will prove two partial converses to this result later. Whenever we refer to a family of functions from some set A into ω as being bounded or unbounded, we mean with respect to the obvious $\leq^+$ order on ω^A (unless we state explicitly $\leq^*$). When $\lambda = \omega$, the two notions of being bounded or unbounded coincide.

Lemma 1.3 *Let $\lambda \leq \theta$ be infinite cardinals. Assume there is $\mathcal{F} = \{f_\beta : \beta < \theta\} \subseteq \omega^\lambda$ so that:*

(a) *$\mathcal{F}$ is unbounded;*

(b) *each $\mathcal{G} \in [\mathcal{F}]^{<\theta}$ is bounded;*

(c) *for all $E \in [\lambda]^{<\lambda}$, $\mathcal{F} \restriction E = \{f_\beta \restriction E : \beta < \theta\}$ is bounded.*

Then there is a (θ, λ)-good set.

Proof. Put $A = \{(\langle \beta, m\rangle, \langle \alpha, n\rangle) : m, n \leq f_\beta(\alpha)\}$. We show:

(I) $(\infty, \infty) \in \overline{A}$;

(II) $(\infty,\infty) \notin \overline{B}$ for all $B \in [A]^{<\theta}$;

(III) $(\infty,\infty) \notin \overline{C}$ whenever $C = A \cap ((\theta \times \omega) \times (E \times \omega))$ and $E \in [\lambda]^{<\lambda}$.

(I) Choose $g \in \omega^\theta$ and $f \in \omega^\lambda$. We have to show that A intersects $V_g \times U_f$. By (a), we can choose $\beta < \theta$ so that $f_\beta \not\leq^+ f$. I.e., for every $k \in \omega$, there is an $\alpha_k < \lambda$ such that $f_\beta(\alpha_k) > f(\alpha_k)$ and $f_\beta(\alpha_k) > k$. Choose k so that $k \geq g(\beta)$. Then $(\langle \beta, f_\beta(\alpha_k)\rangle, \langle \alpha, f_\beta(\alpha_k)\rangle) \in A \cap (V_g \times U_f)$.

(II) Let $B \in [A]^{<\theta}$; let $G = \{\beta < \theta : \exists m, n < \omega \ \exists \alpha < \lambda \ ((\langle \beta, m\rangle, \langle \alpha, n\rangle) \in B)\}$. Then $G \in [\theta]^{<\theta}$. By assumption (b), there is an $f \in \omega^\lambda$ that is a $\leq^+$-bound for $\mathcal{G} = \{f_\beta : \beta \in G\}$. Thus for all $\beta \in G$, there is a $k_\beta \in \omega$ such that for each $\alpha < \lambda$, either $f_\beta(\alpha) \leq k_\beta$ or $f_\beta(\alpha) \leq f(\alpha)$. Define $g : \theta \to \omega$ by $g(\beta) = k_\beta$ for $\beta \in G$, $g(\beta) = 0$ otherwise. We have to show that $B \cap (V_g \times U_f) = \emptyset$. To see this take $(\langle \beta, m\rangle, \langle \alpha, n\rangle) \in B$. Then both m and n are less than or equal to $f_\beta(\alpha)$; thus either $n \leq f_\beta(\alpha) \leq f(\alpha)$ and $\langle \alpha, n\rangle \notin U_f$ or $m \leq f_\beta(\alpha) \leq k_\beta = g(\beta)$ and $\langle \beta, m\rangle \notin V_g$.

(III) Similar; using (c) in place of (b). □

2 (θ,ω)-good sets, (θ,ω)-gaps, and incompactness at singulars, revisited

Before we give a characterization of (θ,ω)-good sets in terms of families of integer-valued functions, we need to recall some facts about (θ,λ)-good sets from [LL]. Given a set $A \subseteq (\theta \times \omega) \times (\lambda \times \omega)$, and ordinals $\beta < \theta$ and $\alpha < \lambda$, we define $H_{\beta\alpha}(A) = H_{\beta\alpha} = \{(m,n) : m, n \in \omega \text{ and } (\langle \beta, m\rangle, \langle \alpha, n\rangle) \in A\}$. We say $H_{\beta\alpha}$ is *closed downward* (abbreviated cdw) if whenever $(m,n) \in H_{\beta\alpha}$, $n' \leq n$, and $m' \leq m$, then $(m', n') \in H_{\beta\alpha}$. The proofs of the following lemmas can be found in [LL].

Lemma 2.1 *Suppose there is a (θ,λ)-good set. Then there is a (θ,λ)-good set A such that each $H_{\beta\alpha}$ is finite and cdw.*

Lemma 2.2 *Suppose $A \subseteq (\theta \times \omega) \times (\lambda \times \omega)$ and that each $H_{\beta\alpha}$ is finite and cdw. Then A accumulates at (∞,∞) in $F_\theta \times F_\lambda$ if and only if*

$$\forall f : \lambda \to \omega \quad \exists \beta < \theta \quad \forall m \in \omega \quad \exists \alpha < \lambda \quad ((\langle \beta, m\rangle, \langle \alpha, f(\alpha)\rangle) \in A).$$

In [G], Gruenhage showed that if there is a (θ, ω)-good set, then $\theta \geq \mathfrak{b}$.

Theorem 2.3 *The following are equivalent:*

(a) *There is an $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \omega^\omega$ of cardinality θ such that $\mathcal{F}$ is $\leq^*$-unbounded, but every $\mathcal{G} \in [\mathcal{F}]^{<\theta}$ is $\leq^*$-bounded.*

(b) *There is a (θ, ω)-good set.*

Proof. (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b) By Lemma 1.3.
(b) $\Rightarrow$ (a) Suppose that A is a (θ, ω)-good set. Without loss of generality, we can assume that each $H_{\beta k} = H_{\beta k}(A)$ is finite and cdw. By Gruenhage's result, $\mathfrak{b} \leq \theta$; so let $\{g_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{b}\} \subseteq \omega^\omega$ be an unbounded family of strictly increasing functions. For $\beta < \theta$ and $\alpha < \mathfrak{b}$, define a function $f_{\beta,\alpha} : \omega \to \omega$ by

$$f_{\beta,\alpha}(k) = \begin{cases} \max\{n : \exists m \ (g_\alpha(m) \geq k \wedge (\langle \beta, m\rangle, \langle k, n\rangle) \in A)\} \\ 0 \quad \text{if the above set is empty.} \end{cases}$$

Set $\mathcal{F} = \{f_{\beta,\alpha} : \beta < \theta \text{ and } \alpha < \mathfrak{b}\}$; we check that (I) $\mathcal{F}$ is $<^*$-unbounded and (II) every $\mathcal{G} \in [\mathcal{F}]^{<\theta}$ is $<^*$-bounded.

(I) Let $f \in \omega^\omega$. Using Lemma 2.2 and the fact that A is (θ, ω)-good, there is a $\beta < \theta$ such that for each $m \in \omega$, there is a $k_m \in \omega$ such that $(\langle \beta, m\rangle, \langle k_m, f(k_m)\rangle) \in A$. Define $g \in \omega^\omega$ by $g(m) = k_m$; then g is finite-to-one. Because the g_α's are $\leq^*$-unbounded, there is an $\alpha < \mathfrak{b}$ such that for infinitely many m, $g_\alpha(m) \geq g(m)$. Then for each such m, $f_{\beta,\alpha}(k_m) \geq f(k_m)$, so that f is not a $\leq^*$-bound for $\mathcal{F}$.

(II) Let $\mathcal{G} \in [\mathcal{F}]^{<\theta}$. Set $G = \{\beta < \theta : \exists \alpha < \mathfrak{b} \ (f_{\beta,\alpha} \in \mathcal{G})\}$. Set $B = A \cap (G \times \omega) \times (\omega \times \omega)$; then (∞, ∞) is not in the closure of B. Choose $g \in \omega^\theta$ and $f \in \omega^\omega$ so that $B \cap (V_g \times U_f) = \emptyset$. We claim that f is a $\leq^*$-bound for $\mathcal{G}$. Fix an $f_{\beta,\alpha} \in \mathcal{G}$. Now, $\beta \in G$, so $(\langle \beta, m\rangle, \langle k, n\rangle) \notin A$ whenever $m > g(\beta)$ and $n > f(k)$. Stated contrapositively, if $(\langle \beta, m\rangle, \langle k, n\rangle)$ is in A, then either $m \leq g(\beta)$ or $n \leq f(k)$. Take $k > g_\alpha(g(\beta))$ and any m such that $g_\alpha(m) \geq k$, then $g_\alpha(m) > g_\alpha(g(\beta))$. Because g_α is strictly increasing, $m > g(\beta)$. Thus, if n is such that $(\langle \beta, m\rangle, \langle k, n\rangle) \in A$, we must have $n \leq f(k)$. Taking the maximum over all such n gives $f_{\beta,\alpha}(k) \leq f(k)$. Thus, whenever $k > g_\alpha(g(\beta))$, we have $f_{\beta,\alpha}(k) \leq f(k)$, whence $f_{\beta,\alpha} \leq^* f$. $\square$

It is a well-known fact, due independently to Hausdorff [H] and Rothberger [R], that the existence of a (θ, ω)-gap in $(\omega^\omega, \leq^*)$ is equivalent to the existence of a well-ordered unbounded sequence of order type θ in $(\omega^\omega, \leq^*)$. This means that the existence of a (θ, ω)-gap implies the existence of a (θ, ω)-good set. It is certainly consistent that the converse is true, (consider, e.g., a model of CH), so it is natural to ask if the converse is true in ZFC. In fact, when $\theta \geq \omega_2$ and $cf(\theta) \geq \omega_1$, there is a model in which there is a (θ, ω)-good set, but only (ω_1, ω_1)- and (ω_1, ω)-gaps.

Before we define the partial orders that give these models, we state some useful lemmas about product forcing. If $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \omega^\omega$ and $g \in \omega^\omega$, we say that $g >^* \mathcal{F}$ if $g >^* f$ for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$. We say that a real f in a universe larger than V is *unbounded over* V if $f \not\leq^* g$ for all $g \in \omega^\omega \cap V$.

Lemma 2.4 *Let $\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ be partial orders. Suppose $\dot{f}$ is a $\mathbb{P}$-name for a real and $\dot{g}$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-name for a real. If $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\dot{f}$ is unbounded over V", then $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\neg(\dot{f} \leq^* \dot{g})$".*

Proof. Fix $n \in \omega$ and $(p, q) \in \mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{Q}$. Because $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\dot{f}$ is unbounded over V", there is an $l \geq n$ such that $\forall m \in \omega$, $\neg(p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\dot{f}(l) \leq m$").

Choose a $q' \leq q$ and an $m \in \omega$ so that $q' \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\dot{g}(l) = m$". Then we can find a $p' \leq p$ and a $k > m$ such that $p' \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\dot{f}(l) = k$". Thus, $(p', q') \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\dot{f}(l) > \dot{g}(l)$". $\square$

Lemma 2.5 *Suppose that $\dot{h}_1$ and $\dot{h}_2$ are $\mathbb{P}$-names for reals, $\dot{g}$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-name for a real, and $(p, q) \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\dot{h}_1 <^* \dot{g} <^* \dot{h}_2$". Then $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\exists j \in \omega^\omega \cap V$ $(\dot{h}_1 <^* j <^* \dot{h}_2)$".*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that for some $k' \in \omega$,

$$(p, q) \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{Q}} \text{“}\forall n \geq k' \ (\dot{h}_1(n) <^* \dot{g}(n) <^* \dot{h}_2(n))\text{”}.$$

For each $n \in \omega$, define $j(n)$ by taking a $q' \leq q$ and an $m \in \omega$ so that $q' \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\dot{g}(n) = m$", and setting $j(n) = m$.

We claim that $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\dot{h}_1 <^* j <^* \dot{h}_2$". Otherwise, for each $k \in \omega$, there is an $n \geq k$ and a $p' \leq p$ such that $p' \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\neg(\dot{h}_1(n) < j(n) < \dot{h}_2(n))$". Fix such a p' and n for the k' given above, and find a $q' \leq q$ such that $q' \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\dot{g}(n) = j(n)$". Then

$$(p', q') \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}\times\mathbb{Q}} \text{“}(\dot{h}_1(n) < \dot{g}(n) < \dot{h}_2(n)) \wedge \neg(\dot{h}_1(n) < j(n) < \dot{h}_2(n)) \wedge (\dot{g}(n) = j(n))\text{”},$$

a contradiction. $\square$

For a set A, $\mathbb{C}_A$ is the partial order $\mathrm{Fn}(A \times \omega, \omega) = \{p : p$ is a finite partial function from $A \times \omega$ into $\omega\}$. V_A is the generic extension of V by $\mathbb{C}_A$. We will need the fact, due to Kunen [Ku], that forcing with $\mathbb{C}_A$ over a model of CH does not add an ω_2-sequence in $(\omega^\omega, \leq^*)$.

Lemma 2.6 *Assume CH and set $\theta = \omega_2$. In V_θ, let $\mathbb{P} = \prod_{\alpha<\theta} \mathbb{P}_\alpha$ be a ccc finite support product of $\aleph_1$-sized partial orders such that $\prod_{\alpha<\beta} \mathbb{P}_\alpha \in V_\beta$. Set $\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{C}_\theta \star \dot{\mathbb{P}}$, and let H be $\mathbb{Q}$-generic over V. Then there are no well-ordered ω_2-sequences in $V[H]$.*

Proof. By way of contradiction, let $\{\dot{f}_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_2\}$ be a collection of $\mathbb{Q}$-names for a well-ordered ω_2-sequence. Without loss of generality, each $\dot{f}_\alpha = \bigcup_{n,m\in\omega}\{(m,n)\} \times A_{mn}$, where A_{mn} is a maximal countable antichain and each $q \in A_{mn}$ has the form $q = (c, \langle \dot{p}_{\alpha_1}, \dot{p}_{\alpha_2}, \ldots \dot{p}_{\alpha_k}\rangle)$, where $c \in \mathbb{C}_\theta$ and $\dot{p}_{\alpha_i} \in \dot{\mathbb{P}}_{\alpha_i}$. I.e., because the supports of conditions in $\dot{\mathbb{P}}$ are finite, we can assume that the $\mathbb{C}_\theta$ part of a condition is strong enough to decide the support of the $\dot{\mathbb{P}}$ part.

Define $\mathrm{suppt}(q) = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_k\}$ and for each $\alpha \in \omega_2$,

$$A_\alpha = \mathrm{suppt}(\dot{f}_\alpha) = \bigcup_{\substack{m,n\in\omega \\ q \in A_{mn}}} \mathrm{suppt}(q).$$

By thinning and re-indexing, we can assume that the A_α's are a delta system with root Δ and that $\alpha < \alpha' < \omega_2$ implies

$$\max \Delta < \min(A_\alpha \setminus \Delta) \leq \max(A_\alpha \setminus \Delta) < \min(A'_\alpha \setminus \Delta).$$

Set $\beta = \max(\Delta) + 1$, and force with $\mathbb{C}_\beta \star \prod_{\alpha<\beta} \dot{\mathbb{P}}_\alpha$. Notice that CH is still true, so if we force with $\mathbb{C}_{[\beta,\theta)}$, we obtain a model V' with no ω_2-chains. We can also assume that each $\dot{f}_\alpha$ is a $\prod_{\xi\in A_\alpha\setminus\Delta} \mathbb{P}_\xi$-name.

Set $E = \{\xi \in \omega_2 \setminus \beta :$ For some even α, $\xi \in A_\alpha \setminus \Delta.\}$, and set $O = \omega_2 \setminus (E \cup \beta)$. Finally, let $\mathbb{P}_E = \prod_{\xi\in E} \mathbb{P}_\xi$ and $\mathbb{P}_O = \prod_{\xi\in O} \mathbb{P}_\xi$.

Working in V', fix a condition $(p, q) \in \mathbb{P}_E \times \mathbb{P}_O$ such that

$$(p, q) \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_E\times\mathbb{P}_O} \text{“}\forall\alpha < \omega_2\ (\alpha \text{ even implies } \dot{f}_\alpha <^* \dot{f}_{\alpha+1} <^* \dot{f}_{\alpha+2})\text{”}.$$

By the Lemma 2.5, we can find for each even $\alpha < \omega_2$, a $p_\alpha \leq p$ and a $j_\alpha \in \omega^\omega \cap V'$ such that

$$p_\alpha \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \text{“}\dot{f}_\alpha <^* j_\alpha <^* \dot{f}_{\alpha+2}\text{”}.$$

Now, because supports are finite and each $|\mathbb{P}_\alpha| \leq \omega_1$, we can find an $A \in [\omega_2]^{\omega_2}$ so that whenever $\alpha, \alpha' \in A$, then p_α and $p_{\alpha'}$ are compatible. But then $\alpha < \alpha' \in A$ implies that $j_\alpha <^* j_{\alpha'}$, contradicting the fact that there are no ω_2-sequences in V'. $\square$

Hechler forcing is the partial order $\mathbb{D} = \{(s, f) : s \in \omega^{<\omega},\ f \in \omega^\omega, \text{ and } s \subseteq f\}$, ordered so that $(s, f) \leq (t, g)$ if and only if $s \supseteq t$ and $\forall n \in \omega\ (f(n) \geq g(n))$. Clearly, $\mathbb{D}$ is σ-centered and adds a real that eventually dominates all ground model reals. The following result has been obtained independently by Judah [J].

Theorem 2.7 *Assume $V \models CH$ and set $\theta = \omega_2$. Then there is a partial order $\mathbb{Q}$ such that whenever H is $\mathbb{Q}$-generic over V, then the following are true in $V[H]$:*

(1) *There is a family $\mathcal{F} = \{f_\alpha : \alpha < \theta\} \subseteq \omega^\omega$ such that:*

   (a) *for all $\beta < \theta$, $\{f_\alpha : \alpha < \beta\}$ is bounded;*

   (b) *$\mathcal{F}$ is unbounded.*

(2) *There are no well-ordered sequences of length ω_2 in $(\omega^\omega, \leq^*)$.*

Proof. We define $\mathbb{Q}$ as a two-step iteration. The first step of the iteration is simply $\mathbb{C}_\theta$. We define the second step by working in V_θ. Let $\mathbb{P}_\beta$ be $\mathbb{D}^{V_\beta}$, i.e., Hechler forcing in the sense of the model obtained by adding the first β-many Cohen reals. In V_θ, each $\mathbb{D}_\beta$ is σ-centered, so the finite support product $\mathbb{P} = \prod_{\beta<\theta} \mathbb{P}_\beta$ is ccc. Hence, $\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{C}_\theta \star \mathbb{P}$ is ccc.

Let H be $\mathbb{Q}$-generic; in $V[H]$, define $\mathcal{F} = \{f_\beta : \beta < \theta\}$, where f_β is the β-th Cohen real. Let g_β be the Hechler real added by $\mathbb{P}_\beta$ over V_θ; because $\{f_\alpha : \alpha < \beta\} \subseteq V_\beta$, we have $f_\alpha \leq^* g_\beta$ for each $\alpha < \beta$. This establishes (a).

Let $\dot{g}$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-name for a real. Note that $\forall \beta < \theta$, we have

$$\mathbb{Q} \cong [(\mathbb{C}_\beta \star \prod_{\alpha<\beta} \dot{\mathbb{P}}_\alpha) \times \mathbb{C}_{[\beta,\theta)}] \star \prod_{\alpha\geq\beta} \dot{\mathbb{P}}_\alpha.$$

By this observation and the fact that $\mathbb{Q}$ is ccc, there is a $\beta < \theta$ such that $\dot{g}$ is a $\mathbb{C}_\beta \star \prod_{\alpha<\beta} \mathbb{P}_\alpha$-name. Because f_β is unbounded over V, Lemma 2.4 and the fact that $\leq^*$ is upwards absolute imply that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\dot{f}_\beta \not\leq^* \dot{g}$". Hence, no real in $V[H]$ bounds $\mathcal{F}$, so (b) is established.

Note that the partial order we've defined satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 2.6, so (2) is also true. $\square$

We can also show, via a modification of the “isomorphism of names” argument originally due to Kunen [Ku], that the forcing construction given above yields a model with no ω_2-sequences when θ is any cardinal (see [Br] for details). When θ is regular, this gives a model with a (θ, ω)-good set, but only (ω_1, ω_1)- and (ω_1, ω)-gaps.

The above proof does not quite suffice to produce a (θ, ω)-good set when θ is a singular cardinal of uncountable cofinality, because we need to bound all small subfamilies of $\mathcal{F}$. Fortunately, we can use the ccc to accomplish this.

Theorem 2.8 *Suppose $V \models GCH$ and that $\omega_1 \leq cf(\theta) < \theta$. Then there is a ccc partial order $\mathbb{Q}$ such that whenever H is $\mathbb{Q}$-generic over V, there is a family $\mathcal{F} = \{f_\alpha : \alpha < \theta\} \subseteq \omega^\theta$ in $V[H]$ such that:*

(1) *$\mathcal{F}$ is unbounded;*

(2) *$\forall \mathcal{G} \in [\mathcal{F}]^{<\theta}$, $\mathcal{G}$ is bounded.*

Proof. As before, $\mathbb{Q}$ will be a two step iteration, with first step $\mathbb{C}_\theta$. Let f_β be the β-th Cohen real, and set $\mathcal{F} = \{f_\beta : \beta < \theta\}$. The second step of the iteration is defined in V_θ as $\prod_{A \in [\theta]^{<\theta}} \mathbb{P}_A$, where $\mathbb{P}_A = \mathbb{D}^{V_A}$, i.e., Hechler forcing in the sense of the model obtained by adding the Cohen reals with indices in A. We therefore have

$$\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{C}_\theta \star \prod_{A \in [\theta]^{<\theta}} \dot{\mathbb{P}}_A.$$

Clearly, $\mathbb{Q}$ is ccc. As before, $\mathcal{F}$ remains unbounded in $V[H]$.

To see that every small family is bounded, take $B \in [\theta]^{<\theta} \cap V[H]$. Because $\mathbb{Q}$ is ccc, there is an $A \in [\theta]^{<\theta} \cap V$ such that $B \subseteq A$. Then the Hechler real added by $\mathbb{P}_A$ bounds $\{f_\beta : \beta \in B\}$. □

Again it can be shown that the model does not contain well–ordered sequences of length ω_2 in $(\omega^\omega, \leq^*)$.

Via the translation results in [LL], this theorem gives a new example of a first countable space in which cwH fails for the first time at a singular cardinal. Notice that this space can be made cwH by removing a countable closed discrete set—a property that previous examples of such spaces did not have.

3 Forcing (θ, λ)-good sets

In this section, we describe notions of forcing for adding (θ, λ)-good sets for some cardinals that satisfy $\omega_1 \le \lambda \le \theta$. The method will be similar to that used in the previous section—but proving that our iteration is ccc will now be non-trivial.

Theorem 3.1 *Let $\lambda \le \theta$ cardinals with $cf(\theta) \ge \omega_1$. Assume either λ is regular or $\lambda^\omega \le \theta$. There is a ccc partial order $\mathbb{P}$ that adds a family $\mathcal{F} = \{f_\xi : \xi < \theta\} \subseteq \omega^\lambda$ satisfying:*

(a) *$\mathcal{F}$ is $\le^+$–unbounded;*

(b) *for all $B \subseteq \theta$ with $|B| < \theta$, $\{f_\xi : \xi \in B\}$ is $\le^*$–bounded;*

(c) *for all $A \subseteq \lambda$ with $|A| < \lambda$, $\mathcal{F}\restriction A = \{f_\xi \restriction A : \xi < \theta\}$ is $\le^*$–bounded.*

Proof. Let V_0 be the ground model. As before, $\mathbb{P} \in V_0$ will be a two-step iteration. To define the first step, we start with a function $H : \theta \to [\lambda]^\omega$ that satisfies either

(1) $\forall A \in [\lambda]^\omega \ (|\xi < \theta : H(\xi) = A\}| = \theta)$

or (in case λ is regular and $\lambda^\omega \le \theta$ fails)

(2) $\forall \xi < \theta \ \forall \zeta < \lambda \ (\zeta \in H(\xi) \Rightarrow \zeta + 1 \in H(\xi))$ and

(3) $\forall \zeta < \lambda \ (cf(\zeta) = \omega \Rightarrow |\{\xi < \theta : \sup(H(\xi)) = \zeta\}| = \theta)$.

We define $\mathbb{P}_0 = \{c \in \mathbb{C}_{\theta \times \lambda} : \forall \xi < \theta \ \forall \zeta < \lambda \ ((\xi, \zeta) \in \mathrm{dom}(c) \Rightarrow \zeta \in H(\xi))\}$, ordered by reverse containment (notice that our notation here is slightly different from section 2: $\mathbb{C}_A$ denotes $Fn(A, \omega)$). Obviously, $\mathbb{P}_0$ is forcing isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}_\theta$; we think of h_ξ (the ξ-th Cohen real added by $\mathbb{P}_0$) as having domain $H(\xi)$. Extend h_ξ to a function $f_\xi \in \omega^\lambda$ by setting $f_\xi(\zeta) = h_\xi(\zeta)$ for all $\zeta \in H(\xi)$ and $f_\xi(\zeta) = 0$ for all $\zeta \notin H(\xi)$.

Let V_1 be the extension of V_0 by $\mathbb{P}_0$. In V_1, we define for each $A \subseteq \lambda$ with $|A| < \lambda$ and $A \in V_0$ and for each $B \subseteq \theta$ with $|B| < \theta$ and $B \in V_0$ partial orders $\mathbb{Q}_A$ and $\mathbb{R}_B$ as follows: $\mathbb{Q}_A = \{\langle s, F\rangle : s \in \mathbb{C}_A \wedge F \in [\theta]^{<\omega}\}$ ordered so that $\langle s, F\rangle \le \langle s', F'\rangle$ if and only if $s \supseteq s'$, $F \supseteq F'$ and

$$\forall \xi \in F' \ \forall \zeta \in \mathrm{dom}(s) \setminus \mathrm{dom}(s') \ (f_\xi(\zeta) \le s(\zeta)).$$

Similarly, $\mathbb{R}_B = \{\langle t, G\rangle : t \in \mathbb{C}_\lambda \wedge G \in [B]^{<\omega}\}$, ordered in the same way as $\mathbb{Q}_A$: $\langle t, G\rangle \leq \langle t', G'\rangle$ if and only if $t \supseteq t'$, $G \supseteq G'$ and

$$\forall \xi \in G' \ \forall \zeta \in \operatorname{dom}(t) \setminus \operatorname{dom}(t') \ (f_\xi(\zeta) \leq t(\zeta)).$$

In V_1, let $\mathbb{P}_1 = \prod_A \mathbb{Q}_A \times \prod_B \mathbb{R}_B$ be the finite support product of the $\mathbb{Q}_A$'s and $\mathbb{R}_B$'s. In V_0, let $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_0 \star \dot{\mathbb{P}}_1$. Also in V_0, let $\langle A_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda'\rangle$ enumerate $[\lambda]^{<\lambda}$ and $\langle B_\beta : \beta < \theta'\rangle$ enumerate $[\theta]^{<\theta}$.

Claim: $\mathbb{P}_1$ is ccc in V_1.

To prove the claim, it suffices to show that for every $A \in [\lambda']^{<\omega}$ and $B \in [\theta']^{<\omega}$, the partial order $\mathbb{P}_0 \star (\prod_{\alpha\in A} \dot{\mathbb{Q}}_{A_\alpha} \times \prod_{\beta \in B} \dot{\mathbb{R}}_{B_\beta})$ is ccc in V_0. For each $\gamma \in \omega_1$, fix a condition

$$p^\gamma = \langle c^\gamma, \langle\langle s^\gamma_\alpha, F^\gamma_\alpha\rangle : \alpha \in A\rangle, \langle\langle t^\gamma_\beta, G^\gamma_\beta\rangle : \beta \in B\rangle\rangle.$$

We don't need to work with names because conditions are finite partial functions, so we can assume the $\mathbb{P}_0$ part of a condition is strong enough to decide the second part. For $c \in \mathbb{P}_0$, set $d(c) = \{\xi < \theta : \exists \zeta \in H(\xi) \ ((\xi, \zeta) \in \operatorname{dom}(c))\}$.

By applying a delta-system argument, we can assume that there are c, s_α, F_α, t_β, and G_β such that $\forall \gamma < \omega_1$, $\forall \alpha \in A$, and $\forall \beta \in B$,

$$p^\gamma = \langle c \cup c^\gamma, \langle\langle s_\alpha \cup s^\gamma_\alpha, F_\alpha \cup F^\gamma_\alpha\rangle : \alpha \in A\rangle, \langle\langle t_\beta \cup t^\gamma_\beta, G_\beta \cup G^\gamma_\beta\rangle : \beta \in B\rangle\rangle$$

and $\forall \gamma < \delta < \omega_1$, $\forall \alpha \in A$, and $\forall \beta \in B$, each of $d(c^\gamma) \cap d(c^\delta)$, $d(c) \cap d(c^\gamma)$, $\operatorname{dom}(s^\gamma_\alpha) \cap \operatorname{dom}(s^\delta_\alpha)$, $F^\gamma_\alpha \cap F^\delta_\alpha$, $\operatorname{dom}(t^\gamma_\beta) \cap \operatorname{dom}(t^\delta_\beta)$, and $G^\gamma_\beta \cap G^\delta_\beta$ is the empty set (this also uses the countability of the sets $H(\xi)$).

We now define $\forall \gamma < \omega_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} P(\gamma) &= d(c^\gamma) \cup \bigcup_{\alpha\in A} F^\gamma_\alpha \cup \bigcup_{\beta \in B} G^\gamma_\beta, \\ Q(\gamma) &= \bigcup_{\alpha \in A} \operatorname{dom}(s^\gamma_\alpha) \cup \bigcup_{\beta\in B} \operatorname{dom}(t^\gamma_\beta), \text{ and} \\ P &= d(c) \cup \bigcup_{\alpha \in A} F_\alpha \cup \bigcup_{\beta \in B} G_\beta. \end{aligned}$$

It is now easy to find $\gamma < \delta < \omega_1$ such that

(i) $\emptyset = P(\gamma) \cap P = P \cap P(\delta) = P(\gamma) \cap P(\delta)$,

(ii) $Q(\gamma) \cap \{\zeta < \lambda : \exists \xi \in d(c^\delta) \cup d(c)\ ((\xi, \zeta) \in \mathrm{dom}(c^\delta))\} = \emptyset$, and

(iii) $Q(\delta) \cap \{\zeta < \lambda : \exists \xi \in d(c^\gamma) \cup d(c)\ ((\xi, \zeta) \in \mathrm{dom}(c^\gamma))\} = \emptyset$.

We claim that p^γ and p^δ are compatible. To see this, note that by (i), (ii), and (iii), we can find a $\hat{c} \supseteq c^\gamma \cup c^\delta$ such that

$(*)$ If $\xi \in P(\gamma) \cup P$ and $\zeta \in H(\xi) \cap Q(\delta)$, then $\langle \xi, \zeta \rangle \in \mathrm{dom}(\hat{c})$ and $\hat{c}(\xi, \zeta) = 0$.

$(**)$ If $\xi \in P(\delta) \cup P$ and $\zeta \in H(\xi) \cap Q(\gamma)$, then $\langle \xi, \zeta \rangle \in \mathrm{dom}(\hat{c})$ and $\hat{c}(\xi, \zeta) = 0$.

Consider the condition

$$p = \langle \hat{c}, \langle \langle s_\alpha \cup s^\gamma_\alpha \cup s^\delta_\alpha, F_\alpha \cup F^\gamma_\alpha \cup F^\delta_\alpha \rangle : \alpha \in A \rangle, \langle \langle t_\beta \cup t^\gamma_\beta \cup t^\delta_\beta, G_\beta \cup G^\gamma_\beta \cup G^\delta_\beta \rangle : \beta \in B \rangle \rangle;$$

we show that $p \leq p^\gamma$ ($p \leq p^\delta$ is similar).

Clearly, all inclusion relations are met. Notice that by $(*)$ and $(**)$ we have $\forall \alpha \in A$, $\forall \zeta \in \mathrm{dom}(s^\delta_\alpha)$, and $\forall \xi \in F_\alpha \cup F^\gamma_\alpha$,

$$0 = \hat{c}(\xi, \zeta) \leq s^\delta_\alpha(\zeta), \text{ or } \zeta \notin H(\xi),$$

and $\forall \beta \in B$, $\forall \zeta \in \mathrm{dom}(t^\gamma_\beta)$, and $\forall \xi \in G_\beta \cup G^\gamma_\beta$,

$$0 = \hat{c}(\xi, \zeta) \leq t^\delta_\beta(\zeta), \text{ or } \zeta \notin H(\xi),$$

so that $p \leq p^\gamma$. This establishes the claim.

Let V_2 be the extension of V_1 by $\mathbb{P}_1$; notice that (b) and (c) of the theorem are true by genericity. To complete the proof of the theorem, we need to show:

Claim: $\mathcal{F}$ is unbounded in V_2.

By way of contradiction, suppose that there is a $\mathbb{P}$-name $\dot{f}$ for an element of ω^λ such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\forall \xi < \theta\ (f_\xi \leq^+ \dot{f})$". (We will see later that $\mathbb{P}$ factors nicely, so if this statement is only forced by some non-trivial condition p, we can replace V_0 with an initial extension obtained from a generic that contains p, and then argue as below.)

Assume first $cf(\lambda) \geq \omega_1$ and $\lambda^\omega \leq \theta$. Using condition (1) of the function H, construct, by recursion on $\gamma < \omega_1$, conditions $p^\gamma = \langle c^\gamma, \langle \langle s^\gamma_\alpha, F^\gamma_\alpha \rangle : \alpha \in A^\gamma \rangle, \langle \langle t^\gamma_\beta, G^\gamma_\beta \rangle : \beta \in B^\gamma \rangle \rangle$ where

$$c^\gamma \Vdash \text{“}\langle s^\gamma_\alpha, F^\gamma_\alpha \rangle \in \dot{\mathbb{Q}}_{A_\alpha} \text{ for } \alpha \in A^\gamma \text{ and } \langle t^\gamma_\beta, G^\gamma_\beta \rangle \in \dot{\mathbb{R}}_{B_\beta} \text{ for } \beta \in B^\gamma\text{”},$$

ordinals $\alpha^\gamma < \lambda$ and $\beta^\gamma < \theta$, and integers $k^\gamma < \omega$ such that if

$$A(\gamma) = \bigcup_{\alpha \in A^\gamma} A_\alpha \text{ and } B(\gamma) = \bigcup_{\beta \in B^\gamma} B_\beta,$$

then

(i) if $cf(\gamma) = \omega$, then $\alpha^\gamma = \sup\{\alpha^\delta : \delta < \gamma\}$;

(ii) if γ is a successor ordinal, then $\forall \delta < \gamma\ (\alpha^\gamma > \alpha^\delta$ and $\alpha^\gamma \notin A(\delta))$;

(iii) $\forall \delta < \gamma\ (\beta^\gamma \notin \{\beta^\delta\} \cup B(\delta) \cup d(c^\delta))$;

(iv) $H(\beta^\gamma) \supseteq \{\alpha^\delta : \delta < \gamma\}$; and

(v) $p^\gamma \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\forall \zeta < \lambda\ (\dot{f}_{\beta^\gamma}(\zeta) \leq k^\gamma$ or $\dot{f}_{\beta^\gamma}(\zeta) \leq \dot{f}(\zeta))$".

To avoid having to work with names, we are again assuming that the $\mathbb{P}_0$ part of a condition is strong enough to decide the $\mathbb{P}_1$ part. Also notice that by conditions (i) and (ii) of the recursion, $S_0 = \{\alpha^\gamma : \gamma < \omega_1\}$ is club in $\alpha' = \sup\{\alpha^\gamma : \gamma < \omega_1\}$. Thus $S \subseteq S_0$ is stationary in α' if and only if $\tilde{S} = \{\gamma < \omega_1 : \alpha^\gamma \in S\}$ is stationary in ω_1.

We now define regressive functions $a, b, c : \omega_1 \to [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$ and $k : \omega_1 \to \omega$ by:

$$\begin{aligned}
a(\gamma) &= \{\delta < \gamma : (A^\gamma \cap A^\delta) \setminus \bigcup_{\epsilon < \delta} A^\epsilon \neq \emptyset\}; \\
b(\gamma) &= \{\delta < \gamma : (B^\gamma \cap B^\delta) \setminus \bigcup_{\epsilon < \delta} B^\epsilon \neq \emptyset\}; \\
c(\gamma) &= \{\delta < \gamma : (d(c^\gamma) \cap d(c^\delta)) \setminus \bigcup_{\epsilon < \delta} d(c^\epsilon) \neq \emptyset\}; \text{ and} \\
k(\gamma) &= k^\gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

By Fodor's lemma, we can find $\Delta_a, \Delta_b, \Delta_c \in [\omega_1]^{<\omega}$, a $k_0 \in \omega$, and a stationary $\tilde{S}_1 \subseteq \omega_1$ such that $\forall \gamma \in \tilde{S}_1$, $a(\gamma) = \Delta_a$, $b(\gamma) = \Delta_b$, $c(\gamma) = \Delta_c$ and $k(\gamma) = k_0$.

Set $\bar{A} = \bigcup_{\gamma \in \Delta_a} A(\gamma)$ and $\bar{B} = \bigcup_{\gamma \in \Delta_b} B(\gamma) \cup \bigcup_{\gamma \in \Delta_c} d(c^\gamma)$. Then for $\gamma \neq \gamma' \in \tilde{S}_1$, we have

(a) $(A^\gamma \cap A^{\gamma'}) \setminus \bigcup_{\delta \in \Delta_a} A^\delta = \emptyset$,

(b) $(B^\gamma \cap B^{\gamma'}) \setminus \bigcup_{\delta \in \Delta_b} B^\delta = \emptyset$, and

(c) $(d(c^\gamma) \cap d(c^{\gamma'})) \setminus \bar{B} = \emptyset$.

We now factor $\mathbb{P}_0$ as $\mathbb{P}_0^0 \times \mathbb{P}_0^1$, where

$$\mathbb{P}_0^0 = \{c \in \mathbb{P}_0 : \forall \zeta < \lambda \, \forall \xi < \theta \, ((\xi, \zeta) \in \operatorname{dom}(c) \Rightarrow \xi \in \bar{B} \vee \zeta \in \bar{A})\}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}_0^1 = \{c \in \mathbb{P}_0 : \forall \zeta < \lambda \, \forall \xi < \theta \, ((\xi, \zeta) \in \operatorname{dom}(c) \Rightarrow \xi \notin \bar{B} \wedge \zeta \notin \bar{A})\}.$$

In turn, if we set $A = \bigcup_{\delta \in \Delta_a} A^\delta$, $B = \bigcup_{\delta \in \Delta_b} B^\delta$,

$$\mathbb{P}_1^0 = \prod_{\alpha \in A} \mathbb{Q}_{A_\alpha} \times \prod_{\beta \in B} \mathbb{R}_{B_\beta} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}_1^1 = \prod_{\alpha \notin A} \mathbb{Q}_{A_\alpha} \times \prod_{\beta \notin B} \mathbb{R}_{B_\beta},$$

then $\mathbb{P}$ can be factored as

$$\mathbb{P} = (\mathbb{P}_0^0 \star \dot{\mathbb{P}}_1^0) \star (\mathbb{P}_0^1 \star \dot{\mathbb{P}}_1^1).$$

Let G^0 be $\mathbb{P}^0 = \mathbb{P}_0^0 \star \dot{\mathbb{P}}_1^0$-generic over V_0, and let $V^0 = V_0[G^0]$. In V^0, set $\mathbb{P}^1 = \mathbb{P}_0^1 \star \dot{\mathbb{P}}_1^1$.

We claim that G^0 can be chosen so that $\tilde{S}^0 = \{\gamma \in \tilde{S}_1 : p^\gamma \restriction \mathbb{P}^0 \in G^0\}$ is a stationary subset of ω_1 in V^0. Otherwise, we can find a $\mathbb{P}^0$-name $\dot{C}$ for a club subset of ω_1 such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}^0}$ "$\forall \gamma < \omega_1 \; (\gamma \in \dot{C} \Rightarrow p^\gamma \restriction \mathbb{P}^0 \notin \dot{G}^0)$". Because $\mathbb{P}^0$ is ccc, we can find a club $C_0 \in V_0$ such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}^0}$ "$C_0 \subseteq \dot{C}$". Take a $\gamma \in C_0 \cap \tilde{S}_1$, then

$$p^\gamma \restriction \mathbb{P}^0 \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}^0} \text{“} p^\gamma \restriction \mathbb{P}^0 \in \dot{G}^0 \text{ and } \gamma \in \dot{C} \text{”},$$

a contradiction.

Let $S^0 = \{\alpha^\gamma : \gamma \in \tilde{S}^0\}$. For $\gamma \in \tilde{S}^0$, define

$$e(\alpha^\gamma) = \max\{\zeta < \alpha^\gamma : (\beta^\gamma, \zeta) \in \operatorname{dom}(c^\gamma)\}.$$

(When we are talking about c^γ (or other parts of conditions), we really mean $c^\gamma \restriction \mathbb{P}_0^1$—this is ok because we've chosen c^γ so that $c^\gamma \restriction \mathbb{P}_0^0 \in G^0$.) Notice that e is regressive on S^0, so there is a stationary $T^0 \subseteq S^0$ and a $\zeta_0 < \alpha'$ so that $\forall \gamma \in T^0 \; (e(\gamma) = \zeta_0)$. Set $\tilde{T}^0 = \{\gamma < \omega_1 : \alpha^\gamma \in T^0\}$.

Now choose $\delta_0 < \omega_1$ so that $\alpha^{\delta_0} \notin \bar{A}$ and $\alpha^{\delta_0} > \zeta_0$. Recall that $\alpha^{\delta_0} \in H(\beta^\gamma)$ whenever $\gamma > \delta_0$ and $\gamma \in \tilde{T}^0$. Also notice that without loss $\beta^\gamma \notin \bar{B}$ for $\gamma \in \tilde{T}^0$. Let $\dot{G}^1$ be the canonical name for a $\mathbb{P}^1$-generic filter over V^0. We claim that

$$(*) \qquad \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}^1} \text{“} \forall k \in \omega \; \exists \gamma \in \tilde{T}^0 \; (p^\gamma \in \dot{G}^1 \wedge \dot{f}_{\beta^\gamma}(\alpha^{\delta_0}) = k) \text{”}.$$

To see this, suppose that $p^1 \in \mathbb{P}^1$ and $k \in \omega$. Say

$$p^1 = \langle c^1, \langle \langle s_\alpha^1, F_\alpha^1 \rangle : \alpha \in A^1 \rangle, \langle \langle t_\beta^1, G_\beta^1 \rangle : \beta \in B^1 \rangle \rangle.$$

By conditions (a)–(c), we can find a $\gamma \in \tilde{T}^0$ such that the following intersections are all empty: $d(c^1) \cap (d(c^\gamma) \cup \{\beta^\gamma\})$, $A^1 \cap A^\gamma$, and $B^1 \cap B^\gamma$.

Set $p_0^\gamma = \langle c^\gamma \cup \{\langle(\beta^\gamma, \alpha^{\delta_0}), k\rangle\}, \langle\langle s_\alpha^\gamma, F_\alpha^\gamma\rangle : \alpha \in A^\gamma\rangle, \langle\langle t_\beta^\gamma, G_\beta^\gamma\rangle : \beta \in B^\gamma\rangle\rangle$, then $p^1 \cup p_0^\gamma$ is a condition extending both p^1 and p_0^γ that forces $\dot{f}_{\beta^\gamma}(\alpha^{\delta_0}) = k$. This establishes $(*)$.

Let G^1 be $\mathbb{P}^1$-generic over V^0, and set $V^1 = V^0[G^1] = V_2$. Let $k_1 = \dot{f}[G^1](\alpha^{\delta_0})$. By $(*)$, there is a $k \in \omega$ and a $\gamma \in \tilde{T}^0$ so that $k > k_0, k_1$ and $\dot{f}_{\beta^\gamma}[G^1](\alpha^{\delta_0}) = k$. This contradicts the fact that each $\dot{f}_{\beta^\gamma}[G^1](\zeta)$ is forced to be less than either k_0 or $\dot{f}[G^1](\zeta)$. This establishes the claim and the theorem in most cases.

In case λ is regular and $\lambda^\omega \leq \theta$ fails, we use conditions (2) and (3) of the function H to carry out a similar construction, replacing (ii) and (iv) by

(ii)′ $\forall \delta < \gamma\ (\alpha^\gamma > \max\{\alpha^\delta, \sup(A(\delta))\})$; and

(iv)′ $\sup(H(\beta^\gamma)) = \alpha^\gamma$ (and thus $cf(\alpha^\gamma) = \omega$).

The rest of the argument is very similar to the first case, and we leave it to the reader to figure out the details.

In case $cf(\lambda) = \omega$, we write $\lambda = \bigcup_n \lambda_n$ where $\lambda_n < \lambda_{n+1} < \lambda$ and the λ_n are regular. We again do a similar construction, this time producing ordinals $\alpha_n^\gamma < \lambda_n$; (i), (ii) and (iv) are generalized to

(i)″ if $cf(\gamma) = \omega$, then $\alpha_n^\gamma = \sup\{\alpha_n^\delta : \delta < \gamma\}$ for all n;

(ii)″ if γ is a successor ordinal, then $\forall n\ \forall \delta < \gamma\ (\alpha_n^\gamma > \alpha_n^\delta$ and, if $A(\delta) \cap \lambda_n$ is bounded in λ_n, then $\alpha_n^\gamma > \sup(A(\delta)))$; and

(iv)″ $H(\beta^\gamma) \supseteq \{\alpha_n^\delta : n \in \omega \wedge \delta < \gamma\}$.

The proof continues as before. Notice that there must be $n \in \omega$ so that $\bar{A} \cap \{\alpha_n^\gamma : \gamma < \omega_1\}$ is bounded in $\{\alpha_n^\gamma : \gamma < \omega_1\}$. We complete the argument with all α^γ replaced by α_n^γ. □

Suppose that $\lambda < \theta$ are uncountable cardinals that satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 3.1. Via the translation results in [LL], the (θ, λ)-good set constructed by Theorem 3.1 gives a new consistent example of a first countable, $<\theta$-cwH space X that is not $\leq\theta$-cwH. The set of non-isolated points of X is the union of two disjoint closed discrete sets D and E, where

$|D| = \theta$, $|E| = \lambda$, both D and E are separated, but D and E are not contained in disjoint open sets. Thus, X can be made cwH by removing the small closed discrete set E.

When $\lambda = \theta$ satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 3.1 and are singular, the space X obtained resembles the first countable $< \theta$-cwH not $\leq \theta$-cwH space constructed in [FS], though the models in which the constructions take place may be quite different. In both spaces, the set of non-isolated points is the union of two disjoint closed discrete sets of cardinality θ, each of which is separated, but that are not contained in a pair of disjoint open sets.

When θ is singular and greater than λ^ω, we obtain a first countable space in which cwH fails for the first time at θ, yet the space can be made cwH by removing a closed discrete set of cardinality λ.

4 Characterizing (θ, θ)-good sets

We now provide a consistent characterization of the existence of (θ, θ)-good sets in terms of families of integer-valued functions. The set-theoretic conditions we require in order to obtain this characterization are true in the models obtained by the Levy or Mitchell collapse of a large cardinal to ω_2 and when PFA^+ holds, so this characterization may be useful in showing the consistency of "there are no (ω_2, ω_2)-good sets".

Recall $\text{cov}(\omega, \theta) = \min\{|\mathcal{C}| : \mathcal{C} \subseteq [\theta]^\omega \wedge \forall B \in [\theta]^\omega \; \exists C \in \mathcal{C} \; (B \subseteq C)\}$. It is well-known that for all $n \in \omega$, $\text{cov}(\omega, \omega_n) = \omega_n$ and that $\text{cov}(\omega, \theta) > \theta$ for θ a cardinal of uncountable cofinality implies there is an inner model with large cardinals.

Theorem 4.1 *Assume $\mathfrak{b} \leq \theta$ and $cov(\omega, \theta) \leq \theta$. Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) *there is a (θ, θ)-good set;*

(ii) *there is an unbounded family $\mathcal{F} = \{f_\beta : \beta < \theta\} \subseteq \omega^\theta$ such that every $\mathcal{G} \in [\mathcal{F}]^{<\theta}$ is bounded and for every $B \in [\theta]^{<\theta}$, $\mathcal{F} \restriction B = \{f_\beta \restriction B : \beta < \theta\}$ is bounded.*

Proof. (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) This follows from Lemma 1.3.

(i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) Let A be a (θ, θ)-good set. We can assume that each $H_{\beta\alpha}$ (defined in Section 2) is symmetric, i.e., $H_{\beta\alpha} = \{(n, m) : (m, n) \in H_{\alpha\beta}\}$. Let $\{B_\delta : \delta < \text{cov}(\omega, \theta)\}$ enumerate a covering family; for $\delta < \text{cov}(\omega, \theta)$, let $r_\delta : \omega \to B_\delta$ be a bijection. Let $\{g_\gamma : \gamma \leq \mathfrak{b}\} \subseteq \omega^\omega$ be an unbounded family of strictly increasing functions.

For $\beta < \theta$, $\delta < \mathrm{cov}(\omega, \theta)$, and $\gamma < \beta$, define a function $f_{\beta\delta\gamma} : \theta \to \omega$ by

$$f_{\beta\delta\gamma}(\alpha) = \begin{cases} \max\{n : \exists m \ (g_\gamma(m) \geq r_\delta^{-1}(\alpha) \wedge (\langle \beta, m\rangle, \langle \alpha, n\rangle) \in A)\} \\ 0 \quad \text{if the above set is empty or } \alpha \notin B_\delta \end{cases}$$

Set $\mathcal{F} = \{f_{\beta\delta\gamma} : \beta < \theta,\ \delta < \mathrm{cov}(\omega, \theta), \text{ and } \gamma < \mathfrak{b}\}$. We claim

(I) $\mathcal{F}$ is unbounded;

(II) whenever $B \in [\theta]^{<\theta}$, then $\mathcal{F} \restriction B$ is bounded; and

(III) whenever $\mathcal{G} \in [\mathcal{F}]^{<\theta}$, then $\mathcal{G}$ is bounded.

The proofs of (II) and (III) are similar to those for Theorem 2.3. For example, to prove (III), fix a $B \in [\theta]^{<\theta}$, and set $A' = A \cap ((\theta \times \omega) \times (B \times \omega))$. Then $(\infty, \infty) \notin \overline{A'}$, so there is a $g \in \omega^\theta$ so that $A' \cap (V_g \times U_g) = \emptyset$. We claim that g is a bound for $\mathcal{F} \restriction B$.

To see this, fix $\beta < \theta$, $\delta < \mathrm{cov}(\omega, \theta)$, and $\gamma < \mathfrak{b}$. Take any $\alpha \in B_\delta \setminus r(\{0, 1, \ldots, g_\gamma(g(\beta))\})$, then $m = r^{-1}(\alpha) > g_\gamma(g(\beta))$. Because g_γ is increasing, $m > g(\beta)$. Thus, if $(\langle \beta, m\rangle, \langle \alpha, n\rangle) \in A'$, we must have $n \leq g(\alpha)$. Taking the maximum over all such n yields $f_{\beta\delta\gamma}(\alpha) \leq g(\alpha)$, so clearly $f_{\beta\delta\gamma} \leq^* g$. The proof of (II) is similar.

To show that (I) is true, we need the following:

Claim: For every $f \in \omega^\theta$, there is a $\beta < \theta$ and a sequence $\{\alpha_m : m \in \omega\}$ so that whenever $m \in \omega$, either $f(\alpha_m) \geq m$ and $(\langle \beta, m\rangle, \langle \alpha_m, f(\alpha_m)\rangle \in A$, or $f(\alpha_m) < m$ and $(\langle \beta, m\rangle, \langle \alpha_m, m\rangle) \in A$.

Suppose otherwise. Then there is an $f \in \omega^\theta$ so that for all $\beta < \theta$, there is an $m_\beta \in \omega$ such that for all $\alpha < \theta$,

($*$) $(\langle \beta, m_\beta\rangle, \langle \alpha, m_\beta\rangle) \in A \Rightarrow f(\alpha) \geq m_\beta$ and

($**$) $(\langle \beta, m_\beta\rangle, \langle \alpha, f(\alpha)\rangle) \in A \Rightarrow f(\alpha) < m_\beta$.

Define $g \in \omega^\theta$ by $g(\beta) = \max\{f(\beta), m_\beta\} + 1$. Because $(\infty, \infty) \in \overline{A}$, there are $\alpha < \beta < \theta$ with $(\langle \beta, g(\beta)\rangle, \langle \alpha, g(\alpha)\rangle) \in A$. Now, $H_{\beta\alpha}$ is cdw, so $(\langle \beta, m_\beta\rangle, \langle a, f(\alpha)\rangle) \in A$; by ($*$), $f(\alpha) < m_\beta$. By symmetry, $f(\beta) < m_\alpha$. Suppose that $m_\beta \leq m_\alpha$ (the other case is dual). Then $(\langle \beta, m_\beta\rangle, \langle \alpha, m_\beta\rangle) \in A$. By ($*$), $f(\alpha) \geq m_\beta$, a contradiction. This proves the claim

To finish the proof of (I), fix $f \in \omega^\theta$, and take $\alpha < \theta$ and $\{\alpha_m : m \in \omega\}$ as in the claim. Find a $\delta < \mathrm{cov}(\omega, \theta)$ so that $\{\alpha_m : m \in \omega\} \subseteq B_\delta$. Define $h \in \omega^\omega$ by $h(m) = r^{-1}(\alpha_m)$; then

h is finite-to-one. Find a $\gamma < \mathfrak{b}$ so that for infinitely many m, $g(m) \leq g_\beta(m)$. Then for such an m, either $f(\alpha) \geq m$ and $f_{\beta\delta\gamma}(\alpha_m) < m$, or $f_{\beta\delta\gamma}(\alpha_m) \geq m$, so that $f_{\beta\delta\gamma} \not\leq^+ f$. $\square$

5 Questions

We have shown for many cardinals $\lambda \leq \theta$ that "there is a (θ, λ)-good set" is consistent. On the other hand, under GCH, there are no (θ, λ)-good sets when $\omega_1 \leq cf(\lambda) \leq \lambda < \theta$, so for these cardinals, the existence of a (θ, λ)-good set is independent of ZFC. There are no (θ, θ)-good sets when θ is singular of countable cofinality (see [LL]), so we ask:

(1) Is it consistent to have a (θ, λ)-good set when $cf(\theta) = \omega$ and $\omega_1 \leq cf(\lambda) \leq \lambda < \theta$?

(2) Suppose that $\omega = cf(\lambda) < \lambda$. Is there, in ZFC, a cardinal θ such that $\lambda < \theta \leq \lambda^\omega$ and there is a (θ, λ)-good set?

Of course, the most important question, originally asked by Dow and Todorčević, is:

(3) Does ZFC imply the existence of an (ω_2, ω_2)-good set?

Todorčević [T] showed that $\square(\omega_2)$ implies that there is a (ω_2, ω_2)-good set. So at least a weakly compact cardinal is required to produce a model with no (ω_2, ω_2)-good sets. Fleissner used $E^\omega_{\omega_2}$ (i.e., "there is a non-reflecting stationary subset of ω_2 consisting of ordinals of countable cofinality") to construct a first countable, $<\omega_2$-cwH space that is not $\leq\omega_2$-cwH, so $E^\omega_{\omega_2}$ can also be used to produce an (ω_2, ω_2)-good set.

Recall that Beaudoin (and independently, Magidor) showed that PFA is consistent with $E^\omega_{\omega_2}$, while PFA^+ implies that stationary sets reflect. We conclude with:

(4) Does PFA^+ imply that there are no (ω_2, ω_2)-good sets?

References

[Br] J. Brendle. Notes.

[FS] W. G. Fleissner and S. Shelah. Incompactness at singulars. *Topology Appl.*, 31:101–107, 1989.

[G] G. Gruenhage. k-spaces and products of closed images of metric spaces. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 80(3):477–482, 1980.

[H] F. Hausdorff. Die Graduierung nach dem Endverlauf. Abhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften. *Mathematisch–Physische Klasse* 31(1909), 296–334.

[J] H. Judah. Private communication.

[K] P. Koszmider. Kurepa trees and topological non-reflection. Preprint.

[Ku] K. Kunen. Inaccessibility properties of cardinals. Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford, 1968.

[LL] T. LaBerge and A. Landver. Tightness in products of fans and psuedo-fans. Preprint.

[R] F. Rothberger. Sur les familles indénombrables de suites de nombres naturels et les problèmes concernant la propriété C. *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.*, 37:109–126, 1941.

[T] S. Todorčević. My new fan. Preprint.

Addresses: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TUEBINGEN, TUEBINGEN, GERMANY

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNION COLLEGE, SCHENECTADY, NY, 12308, USA

E-mail: `jobr@michelangelo.mathematik.uni-tuebingen.de`
`laberget@gar.union.edu`